Applicant(s) Application No. BANERJEE ET AL. 10/698.061 Interview Summary Art Unit **Examiner** Brian P. Johnson 2183 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (3) Virgil Beaston. (1) Brian P. Johnson. (4) Gaurav Asthana. (2) _____. Date of Interview: 05 October 2006. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference 2) applicant's representative c) Personal [copy given to: 1) □ applicant e) No. Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 23. Identification of prior art discussed: Kubota. Agreement with respect to the claims f) \boxtimes was reached. g) \square was not reached. h) \square N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Amendments were suggested for the independent claims and agreed upon by Examiner. The rejection under 35 USC 101 was discussed, but no agreement was reached. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
EDDIE CHAN
EDDIE CHAN
EDDIE CHAN
EDDIE CHAN

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature if required

Application No. Applicant(s) BANERJEE ET AL. 10/698,061 Interview Summary Art Unit Examiner Brian P. Johnson 2183 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (3) Virgil Beaston. (1) Brian P. Johnson. (4)Gaurav Asthana. 💋 (2) _____. Date of Interview: 05 October 2006. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e)⊠ No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 23. Identification of prior art discussed: Kubota. Agreement with respect to the claims f) \boxtimes was reached. g) \square was not reached. h) \square N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Amendments were suggested for the independent claims and agreed upon by Examiner. The rejection under 35 USC 101 was discussed, but no agreement was reached. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE. OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. TECHNOTOGY CENTER 2100 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature if required